Appln. No.: 09/643,630
Response submitted Oct. 7, 2004
Reply to Office action dated April 8, 2004

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0028-00
InterTrust Ref. No. IT-27.1 (US)

REMARKS

By this Amendment, Applicants respond to the Office Action dated April 8, 2004 ("the Office Action"), in which claims 1-21 were rejected. By this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 19-21 without prejudice. Accordingly, claims 1-18 are now pending. Authorization is hereby given to charge any fees (e.g., extension fees) associated with this response to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Ginter

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,427,140 to Ginter et al. ("Ginter"). Claim 1 recites a secure processing unit having, among other elements, a level-one page table, the level-one page table including a plurality of level-one page table entries, wherein the level-one page table entries each correspond to at least one level-two page table, and wherein the level-one page table entries each contain a predefined attribute, the predefined attribute being operable to indicate to the memory management unit whether entries in a corresponding level-two page table may designate certain predefined memory regions.

Applicants submit that Ginter does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a level-one page table where the entries each contain a predefined attribute, the predefined attribute being operable to indicate to the memory management unit whether entries in a corresponding level-two page table may designate certain predefined memory regions. Instead, the cited portions of Ginter describe aspects of a secure processing unit (SPU) (see, e.g., Office Action at page 5, citing Ginter, col. 69, lines 9-28 and lines

Appln. No.: 09/643,630
Response submitted Oct. 7, 2004
Reply to Office action dated April 8, 2004

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0028-00
InterTrust Ref. No. IT-27.1 (US)

35-50) and indicate that "due to the practical limits on the amount of ROM 532 and RAM 534 that may be included within SPU 500, SPU 500 may store information in memory external to it, and move this information into and out of its secure internal memory space on an as needed basis. In these cases, secure processing steps performed by an SPU typically must be segmented into small, securely packaged elements that may be 'paged in' and 'paged out' of the limited available internal memory space." (Ginter, col. 69 lines 35-43).

There is no indication that, the "paged in and paged out" feature of Ginter corresponds to the level-one page table entries that correspond to at least one level-two page table, much less that the level-one page table entries each contain a predefined attribute, the predefined attribute being operable to indicate to the memory management unit whether entries in a corresponding level-two page table may designate certain predefined memory regions. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Ginter.

Claims 3-5, 7-8 and 10 are dependent on claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 1.

Similarly, claim 11 recites an information appliance having, among other elements, a level-one page table and a plurality of level-two page tables, the level-one page table including a plurality of level-one page table entries and the level-two page table including a plurality of level-two page table entries, wherein the level-one page table entries each correspond to at least one level-two page table, and wherein the level-one page table entries each contain a predefined attribute, the predefined attribute

Appln. No.: 09/643,630
Response submitted Oct. 7, 2004
Reply to Office action dated April 8, 2004

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0028-00
InterTrust Ref. No. IT-27.1 (US)

being operable to indicate to the memory management unit whether a corresponding level-two page table may designate certain predefined memory regions.

Applicants submit that Ginter does not teach or disclose, *inter alia*, a level-one page table where the entries correspond to at least one level-tow page table, and wherin the level-one page table entries each contain a predefined attribute, the predefined attribute being operable to indicate to the memory management unit whether a corresponding level-two page table may designate certain predefined memory regions. Instead, the cited portions of Ginter describe aspects of a secure processing unit (SPU) (see, e.g., Office Action at pages 8 and 9, citing Ginter, col. 69, lines 35-50), and indicate that "due to the practical limits on the amount of ROM 532 and RAM 534 that may be included within SPU 500, SPU 500 may store information in memory external to it, and move this information into and out of its secure internal memory space on an as needed basis. In these cases, secure processing steps performed by an SPU typically must be segmented into small, securely packaged elements that may be 'paged in' and 'paged out' of the limited available internal memory space." (Ginter, col. 69 lines 35-43).

There is no description in Ginter of a plurality of level-two page tables, nor is there an indication that the "paged in and paged out" feature of Ginter corresponds to the level-one page table entries that correspond to at least one level-two page table, and wherein the level-one page table entries each contain a predefined attribute, the predefined attribute being operable to indicate to the memory management unit whether a corresponding level-two page table may designate certain predefined memory

Appln. No.: 09/643,630
Response submitted Oct. 7, 2004
Reply to Office action dated April 8, 2004

PATENT
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 07451.0028-00
InterTrust Ref. No. IT-27.1 (US)

regions. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is patentable over Ginter.

Claims 12-16 and 18 are dependent on claim 11, and are thus allowable for at least the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 11.

Claims 19-21 have been canceled without prejudice, and thus the rejection of these claims is now moot.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 7, 2004

By: _____
Andrew B. Schwaab
Reg. No. 38,611

Finnegan Henderson Farabow
Garrett & Dunner L.L.P.
1300 I Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-4000